arXiv:cond-mat/9410011v1 5 Oct 1994

Faculteit der Technische Natuurkunde, Technische Universiteit Delft,
2628 CJ Delft, the Netherlands

In 1827 George Simon Ohm formulated his law thus pioneering studies of electric conductivity.

In 1970 Rolf Landauer [1] has published a contribution establishing a modern *scattering* approach to the conductivity. In the framework of this approach, a conductor is treated as a single complicated scaterrer. It is feasible for *coherent* conductors, where resistive region so small that no inelastic process takes place when a carrier traverses the region.

In the last quarter of the 20th century such discoveries as weak localization, universal conductance fluctuations and conductance quantization in ballistic regime have expanded by far our knowledge of quantum transport in coherent conductors. The scale of the abovementioned effects comprises several conductance quanta $G_Q = e^2/(2\pi\hbar)$. This is why those are marginal for classical conductors having conductance $\gg G_Q$.

In 1992 Beenakker and Büttiker [2] discovered that the excess noise power in coherent diffusive *classical* conductor comprises exactly one third of its *classical* estimation. In my opinion, the importance and impact of this work has not yet been fully appreciated. This is a new finding in classical conductivity, in the area which seemed to be exhaustively explored shortly after Ohm's discovery. This work explicitly shows that to complete our knowledge of classical conductivity, we have to know a scattering characteristic of a conductor: its *transmission distribution*.

The purpose of this article is to give a set of rules to compute this transmission distribution. Those are based on solid microscopic background. They are no more complicated than Ohm's law and possess in fact the similar structure. We call it *generalized Ohm's law*.

This work is intended to be comprehensive and is structured as follows. In introductory section I remind the reader the basics of Ohm's approach and scattering approach to conductivity. The second section presents a microscopic derivation of the generalized Ohm's law and shall be skipped by everyone who is not interested in such details. Diffusive conductors are discussed in the third section. The important fourth section contains a concise formulation of the generalized Ohm's law in terms of a circuit theory and shows how to deal with tunnel junctions and quantum point contacts. Examples and results are to be found in the last section.

1 Introduction

1.1 Ohm's law

In its global form, Ohm's law relates the total current in a conductor to the potential drop over it,

$$I = GV, \tag{1}$$

G being conductivity. It is valid for any conductor at small voltages and is in fact trivial. The local form of Ohm's law contains more information. It relates local current density and local voltage gradient,

$$j^\alpha(x) = -\sigma(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\alpha}V(x). \tag{2}$$

The conservation of current implies that div$\mathbf{j} = 0$. Therefore voltage distribution over the conductor obeys

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\alpha}\sigma(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\alpha}V(x) = 0. \tag{3}$$

It must also satisfy boundary conditions

$$V(x) = 0, x \to -\infty \quad V(x) = V, x \to \infty \tag{4}$$

$$N^\alpha(x)j^\alpha(x) = 0, \qquad x \subset \text{boundary}, \tag{5}$$

$N^\alpha(x)$ being vector normal to the boundary in a given point x. The latter condition can be extended to describe interfaces in the conductor if any:

$$N^\alpha(x)j^\alpha(x) = g(x)(V_1(x) - V_2(x)), \tag{6}$$

here unit area conductivity of the interface $g(x)$ relates the current density and voltage drop at the interface.

Eq. 3 with boundary condition determines the total conductance: the total current through an arbitrary cross-section of the conductor equals GV.

The calculation of conductance is a practical problem of elecroengeering. We would have used candles to light if we had to solve differential equations for such calculation. Indeed, there is a finite element approximation of Eqs. 3, 5, 6 known as *circuit theory*. The conductor is separated in finite elements connected in nodes. Conservation of the current in nodes with current- voltage relations for each element set the voltage in each node and finally determine the total conductance.

1.2 Transmission matrix

Alternatively, electronic conductance can be treated as a complicated elastic quantum scattering problem. The conventional way to start is to regard terminals of the conductor as semi-infinite perfectly conducting leads of finite width. Due to quantization of transverse momentum, there is a finite set of propagating channels in the leads at given energy. Transmission matrix t_{nm} is defined in the basis of incoming channels in one of the wires and outgoing channels in another wire. If the incident beam is concentrated in the channel n, the wave function in another wire takes the form $\sum_m t_{nm}|m>$.

Landauer formula expresses the conductance in terms of eigenvalues of the transmission matrix square, $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{t}\mathbf{t}^\dagger$,

$$G = G_Q \mathrm{Tr}\mathbf{T} = G_Q \sum_n T_n. \tag{7}$$

Transmissions T_n are distributed from 0 to 1.

Specific values of T_n's are sensitive to the configuration of impurities in the sample. To characterize a big classical conductor, we introduce transmission distribution averaging over all possible impurity configurations,

$$\rho(T) = \sum_n < \delta(T - T_n) > . \tag{8}$$

In a disordered conductor all channels seem alike, and one might assume comparable transmissions $T_n \simeq l/L$ for all channels, l and L being mean free path and the sample size respectively. The latter estimation would follow from the comparison with Ohm's law.

As it was first shown by Oleg Dorokhov [3], this is completely wrong. In fact, most of the channels are "closed" possessing exponentially small transmission. The transport is due to a few "open" channels [4] having transmissions of the order of unity, and the distribution of those,

$$\rho(T) \equiv < \sum_n \delta(T - T_n) > = \frac{G}{2G_Q} \frac{1}{T\sqrt{1-T}} \equiv \rho_0(T), \tag{9}$$

is universal. Such an unusual fact concerning matrix eigenvalues should be comprehended in the framework of a certain random matrix theory, and the relation (9) can be proven by random matrix methods [5]. Let us stress that both methods essentially exploit an assumption of a uniform quasi-one-dimensional conductor,that is, are formally valid only if the length of the disordered region by far exceeds its width.

It has been proven in [6] that Eq. 9 holds for a diffusive conductor of an arbitrary shape. It was indicated there that this result does not hold if the scattering is not diffusive in a part of the sample. It is the case when there are extended defects in the conductor such as grain boundaries, tunnel barriers, cracks. It is the case when the resistivity of the sample at least partially determined by ballistic transmission, that is, there are (quantum) point contacts in the circuit.

1.3 THe use of transmissions

At first sight, the transmission distribution does not seem very practical. We know the conductance of the conductor

$$G = G_Q \int_0^1 dT T \rho(T) \tag{10}$$

anyhow, why should we know the detailed shape of $\rho(T)$?

Recently it has been recognized that many *other* transport properties of the conductor can be expressed in terms of transmission distribution. We list them below.

Büttiker [7] and Lesovik [8] have found that the magnitude of a shot noise in a conductor may be expressed in terms of transmissions:

$$P = 2G_Q|eV|\sum_n T_n(1-T_n). \tag{11}$$

Classical Poisson noise $P_{Poisson} = 2eI$ would correspond to the first term in brackets. It is convenient to characterize the shot noise power by the suppression factor

$$P/P_{Poisson} = 1 - \sum_n T_n^2 / \sum_n T_n. \tag{12}$$

Lesovik and Levitov [9] managed to provide a complete description of the temporal current fluctuations. They found that the number of electrons having passed the conductor in channel n obeys binomial statistics, probability P_K for K electrons to pass for the time t_0 being

$$P_K = T_n^K (1-T_n)^{N-K} C_N^K. \tag{13}$$

Here $N \equiv eVt_0$, C_N^K being binomial coefficients.

Beenakker has found the scattering approach to be useful in superconductivity. Conductance of the normal conductor in series with a superconductor is due to Andreev reflection. Such Andreev conductivity is given by [10]

$$G_A = 2G_Q \sum_n \frac{T_n^2}{(2-T_n)^2} \tag{14}$$

If a normal conductor is placed between two superconductors, nondissipative Josephson current may flow through the system. It depends on phase difference ϕ_{sup} between superconductors and is given by [11]

$$I_J(\phi_{sup}) = \frac{\pi\Delta \sin\phi_{sup}}{2e} G_Q \sum_n \frac{T_n}{\sqrt{1-T_n \sin^2(\phi_{sup}/2)}} \tag{15}$$

Δ being the energy gap in the superconductors. These two formulas are approximate being only suitable for small structures at low temperatures. The limits of their validity are discussed in [10], [11].

Averaging Eqs. 12, 14, 15 with a proper transmission distribution, we are able to find the corresponding transport properties of the conductor.

Very recently Nieuwenhuizen and van Rossum [12] have found an important relation between the transmission distribution and intensity distribution of waves transmitted through a multiple scattering medium. The latter can be directly measured by optical means.

Since the importance and physical relevance of the transmission distribution is established, it is worthwhile to calculate it from the standard microscopic model.

2 Microscopic method for transmission matrix

2.1 Green's functions and transmission

Green's function technique for disordered conductors have been elaborated in detail (see, e.g. [13]) and we will use this one. Therefore, as a first step we have to establish the relation between Green functions and the transmission matrix amplitudes. Let us consider first a disordered region with two perfect leads attached. Transverse motion in the leads is quantized giving rise to discrete modes. The traversal motion along the coordinate z is not quantized. Electron Green function $G^{A(R)}_{nm}(\epsilon; z, z')$, n, m being transverse mode indexes, describes an evolution of a wave packet at energy close to

Fermi level that stars at point $z(z')$. Let us take two cross-sections of the leads, one far to the left and another one to the right. At the cross-sections, the electron wave functions are given by asymptotes of scattered waves. This allows to write for transmission from left to right:

$$t_{mn} = i\sqrt{v_n v_m} G^A_{mn}(z, z'), \tag{16}$$

where z, z' belong to the left and right cross-sections respectively. The conjugated matrix is expressed through G_R.

We are ready to find expressions for $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{t}^\dagger \mathbf{t})^n$. We replace summation over the quantized modes by integration over the transverse coordinates. Green function should be written in the coordinate representation, thus given by (x is three-dimensional coordinate)

$$(\epsilon \pm i\delta - \epsilon(\hat{p_1}) - U(x))G^{R,A}(x_1, x_2) = \delta(x_1 - x_2), \tag{17}$$

$U(x)$ being random impurity potential.

For the lowest order trace this yields

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{t}^\dagger \mathbf{t}) = \int d^3x_1 d^3x_2 d^3x_3 d^3x_4 v_1(x_1, x_2) G^A(x_2, x_3) v_2(x_3, x_4) G^R(x_4, x_1). \tag{18}$$

Here $v_{1(2)}(x, x')$ stands for the operator of the current through left (right) cross-section. Eq.(18) contains a correlator of two current operators and it is easy to see that this is equivalent to Kubo formula for conductivity. All traces of this kind possess the same operator structure, that we write symbolically as

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbf{t}^\dagger \mathbf{t})^n = \mathrm{Tr}_x (v_1 G^A v_2 G^R)^n. \tag{19}$$

It seems like (19) shall depend on a choice of cross-sections, but it is not true. This can be checked with (17) and follows from conservation law for the current. Moreover, this does not depend on the shape of a cross-section and whether it is in a lead or in a disordered region. In this way, one can relax the requirement of perfect leads (which is the weakest point of Landauer formalism).

2.2 Multicomponent Green's function

In this way we can compute the trace of every power of $\mathbf{T}$ but our goal is to find the transmission distribution. The idea is to relate a sum of (19) taken with certain weights, first, to the transmission distribution, second,

to a trace of a certain multicomponent Green function in the field of a fictitious potential. This potential couples advanced and retarded functions, therefore resulting Green function must be two-by-two matrix labeled by indexes $i, j = A, R$. We introduce such Green function by the following equation: (hats denote two-by-two matrices)

$$\hat{G}(x_1, x_2) = \hat{G}^{(0)}(x_1, x_2) + \int d^3x_3 d^3x_4 \hat{G}^{(0)}(x_1, x_3) \\ (\zeta_1 v_1(x_3, x_4)\hat{\tau}^\dagger + \zeta_2 v_2(x_3, x_4)\hat{\tau})\hat{G}(x_4, x_2), \tag{20}$$

$\zeta_{1,2}$ characterizing the fictitious potential at the crosssections. Here the following matrices have been used:

$$\hat{G} = \begin{pmatrix} G^A & 0 \\ 0 & G^R \end{pmatrix}; \hat{\tau} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \tag{21}$$

$G^{A,R}$ satisfying (17). By standard Green's function methods we can derive the key result of the microscopic approach:

$$\int d^3x_1 d^3x_2 v_1(x_1, x_2) \mathrm{Tr}(\hat{\tau}^\dagger \hat{G}(x_1, x_2)) = \zeta_2 \mathrm{Tr}(\frac{\mathbf{t}^\dagger \mathbf{t}}{1 - \zeta_1 \zeta_2 \mathbf{t}^\dagger \mathbf{t}}) \equiv \zeta_2 \mathrm{F}(\zeta_1 \zeta_2) \tag{22}$$

It is easy to check that Taylor series of (22) in $\zeta_1\zeta_2$ will give operators in (19). We see that the function $F(x)$ may be an immediate output of microscopic calculation. The transmission distribution will be related to $F(x)$ at complex x.

2.3 Semiclassical equations

The wisdom of Green's function technique allows one to average easily the Green's function in use over configurations of scatterers. In semiclassical approach we are in it can be expressed as

$$< \hat{G}(x_1, x_2) >= \hat{G}^{(0)}(x_1, x_2) + \int d^3x_3 d^3x_4 \hat{G}^{(0)}(x_1, x_3) \\ (\zeta_1 v_1(x_3, x_4)\hat{\tau}^\dagger + \zeta_2 v_2(x_3, x_4)\hat{\tau} + \hat{\Sigma}_{imp}(x_3, x_4)) < \hat{G}(x_4, x_2) >, \tag{23}$$

The impurity selfenergy Σ_{imp} may take a simple form for white noise random potentilal [13]

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{imp}(x, x') = \frac{1}{2\pi\tau(x)} \hat{G}(x, x')\delta(x - x') \tag{24}$$

$\tau(x)$ being (space-dependent) electron transport time, ν being density of states near Fermi level per one spin direction.

In the following we will keep one of the most beaten tracks of condensed matter physics. It starts from Green's function relations similar to (23) that treats scatterers in microscopic level. It passes the stage of Boltzman master equation where information about scatterers is presented in form of transition probabilities. It finally comes to diffusion equations where all information about scattering is compacted into diffusion coefficient $D(x)$. It is a straight way for one component Green's function, we shall do with a multicomponent one. Fortunately, the multicomponent Green's functions have been explored in connection with superconductivity, and technique we use exhibits many similarities with the one developed to study non-equilibrium properties of superconductors [16]. Refs. [16], [14] show in detail how to deal with multicomponent Green's functions at every turn of the track, and I will skip technicalities referring a reader to these papers.

The derivation ends up with an effective diffusion equation for the averaged Green function in coinciding points, $\hat{G}(x,x) \equiv i\pi\nu\hat{\Lambda}(x)$. The matrix $\hat{\Lambda}$ obeys unitary condition $\hat{\Lambda}^2 = \hat{1}$. The diffusion coefficient can be expressed in terms of local conductivity $\sigma(x)$, $D(x) = \sigma(x)/(2e^2\nu)$. The resulting diffusion equation can be written as a conservation law for matrix current:

$$\frac{\partial j_\alpha(x)}{\partial x_\alpha} = 0; \quad j_\alpha(x) = \sigma(x)\hat{\Lambda}^{-1}\frac{\partial\hat{\Lambda}}{\partial x_\alpha}. \tag{25}$$

The fictitious potential may be incorporated into boundary conditions at left and right infinity:

$$\hat{\Lambda}(-\infty) = \hat{\sigma}_z; \qquad \hat{\Lambda}(\infty) = \hat{S}\hat{\Lambda}(-\infty)\hat{S}^{-1} \tag{26}$$

$$\text{where} \quad \hat{S}(\zeta_1,\zeta_2) = \exp(i\zeta_1\hat{\tau}^\dagger)\exp(i\zeta_2\hat{\tau}), \tag{27}$$

so that the solution of (25) explicitly does not depend upon the choice of cross-sections. The same is true for the value of interest(22) which can be expressed in terms of the total matrix current through an arbitrary cross-section of the conductor as follows:

$$\zeta_2 F(\zeta_1\zeta_2) = i\pi \mathrm{Tr}\hat{\tau}^\dagger\hat{I}/G_Q \tag{28}$$

$$\hat{I} \equiv \int_S \hat{j}_\alpha(x) N_\alpha(x),$$

N_α being normal vector to the cross-section surface. The result does not depend on the cross-section since the current conserves.

At arbitrary ζ_1, ζ_2 Eq. (25) is in general a complex nonlinear matrix equation. Fortunately, the solution we are searching for can be found easily. Let us parameterize $\hat{\Lambda}$ as follows:

$$\hat{\tilde{\Lambda}} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & \sin\theta/B \\ B\sin\theta & -\cos\theta \end{pmatrix}; \quad B \equiv -i\sqrt{\frac{\zeta_2}{\zeta_1(1-\zeta_1\zeta_2)}} \tag{29}$$

Under this parameterization, the diffusion equation (25) becomes linear,

$$\hat{j}_\alpha = \sigma(x)\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_\alpha}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1/B \\ B & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\alpha}\sigma(x)\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_\alpha} = 0. \tag{30}$$

It is convenient to choose $\zeta_1 = \zeta_2 = \sin(\phi/2)$ and introduce by definition the following quantities

$$F(\phi) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}(\frac{\mathbf{t}^\dagger\mathbf{t}}{1-\sin^2(\phi/2)\mathbf{t}^\dagger\mathbf{t}}), \quad I(\phi) \equiv G_Q \sin\phi \mathrm{Tr}(\frac{\mathbf{t}^\dagger\mathbf{t}}{1-\sin^2(\phi/2)\mathbf{t}^\dagger\mathbf{t}}) \tag{31}$$

to characterize transmission distribution. The distribution of transmissions can be extracted from $F(\phi)$ or $I(\phi)$ in a complex plane of ϕ. Using the identity $\pi\delta(x) = \mathrm{Im}((x - i0))$ we show that

$$\rho(T) = \frac{\rho_0(T)}{\pi G} \ \mathrm{Re}(I(\pi + i\ \mathrm{arccosh}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}))). \tag{32}$$

Boundary conditions (27) take then a simple form

$$\theta(-\infty) = 0, \theta(\infty) = \phi \tag{33}$$

Making use of Eqs. 28, 31 we prove that

$$I(\phi) = -\int_S \sigma(x) N^\alpha \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_\alpha}, \tag{34}$$

the integral may be taken over an arbitrary crosssection of the sample.

3 Universality of diffusive conductors

In the previous section we developed a microscopic approach to transmission matrix and found that the function $I(\phi)$ that characterizes the transmission distribution can be determined from Eq.30, boundary condition (33), by

means of relation 34. I shall stress that $I(\phi)$ is a function of transmission matrix defined by (31). By no means it is an electric current.

However let us recognize a striking similarity between (30) and Laplace equation (3) that express Ohm's law. Now we can immediately relate $\theta(x)$ to potential distribution in the conductor biased by the potential difference ϕ. Therefore, $I(\phi)$ equals the total current through the conductor biased by ϕ and

$$I(\phi) = G\phi \tag{35}$$

by definition of conductance. Applying (32) we obtain

$$\rho(T) = \rho_0(T).$$

So we have proved the validity of(9) for an arbitrary diffusive conductor. This is because the problem can be related to the solution of the equation determining the voltage distribution in the conductor.

4 Circuit theory

4.1 Circuits of diffusive conductors

We saw in the previous chapter that the microscopic problem of finding the transmission distribution can be reduced to a simple form, that resembles much the procedure of finding the sample conductance if the local conductivity is known.

Indeed, we have a "voltage drop" ϕ over the conductor and distribution of local "potentials" $\theta(x)$. Local "current" density is related to local gradient of $\theta(x)$. Conservation of the "current" enables us to find the "potential" distribution. If we know the latter we can calculate the total "current" $I(\phi)$ through the sample. The last step is specific: we shall determine the transmission distribution from $I(\phi)$ by making use of Eq. 32.

This prompts a further simplification which is well-known from electric conductivity theory. To describe complicated, compound, artificially designed systems we can use a kind of circuit theory. We will consider only two terminal circuits. Let us separate a conductor into finite elements connected in nodes. Each node has a certain "potential". The "current" through each element is given by the "potential" difference dropping on it. The conservation of the "current" in nodes enables us to find the total "current" $I(\phi)$ and to solve the transmission distribution for the network given. The rigorous

circuit theory rules will be formulated below. Let us first understand why we need those.

Indeed, if we assemble the circuit from the diffusive conductors there is no problem whatsoever. The transmission distribution is "universal" depending on the total conductivity only. In circuit language, this is a property of a *linear* circuit($I(\Delta\theta) = G\Delta\theta$ for diffusive elements): if "current" is directly proportional to the voltage drop for each element, the same is true for the whole circuit.

The situation is different if some of the elements possess non-linear $I-\theta$ characteristic. What are these special circuit elements? Do they occur in reality?

4.2 Special circuit elements

The answer is positive. If we consider a realistic microstructure, very often it contains non-diffusive elements. There may be tunnel junctions partitioning off the conductor. The resistivity of the structure may be dominated by ballistic transmissions, like in (quantum) point contact arrays. There is a great current interest in hybrid structures of different kinds. Combining diffusive conductors, tunnel junctions and ballistic constrictions, one can obtain a variety of coherent devices. The circuit theory we present can deal with those.

We show below that the tunnel junctions and ballistic constrictions possess non-linear $I-\theta$ characteristic. To avoid confusion, I shall stress that their $I-V$ curves are supposed to be linear. To obtain $I-\theta$ characteristics, we start immediately from the definition (31).

Let us consider first a tunnel junction. If the tunnel barrier is thick enough, the transmissions are much smaller than unity. From Eq. 31 we get

$$F(\phi) = \sum_n T_n = G_T; \quad I(\phi) = G_T \sin\phi \tag{36}$$

An alternative, more microscopic approach, would be to derive boundary condition for $\Lambda(x)$ at the barrier, which is similar to Eq. 6. This work has been performed by Kuprianov and Lukichev for superconductivity [17]. It has been shown in [6] to lead to the same results as Eq. 36.

Another important element is a quantum point contact. [18, 19] By virtue of the semiclassical approach we use we are able to consider only wide QPC, with many propagating modes, $G \gg G_Q$. For a QPC, all the

transmissions are either zero or unity. Then the functions in use become

$$F(\phi) = \frac{G_{QPC}}{\cos^2(\phi/2)}; I(\phi) = 2G_{QPC}\tan(\phi/2). \tag{37}$$

The important point to be clarified is how to conjugate these elements. By virtue of the diffusion approach developed we shall assume that the special elements are connected with diffusive conductors. The resistivity of those, however, can be vanishing in comparison with the resistivity of the special elements. In this case we can say the special elements are *directly* connected. We shall assume, however, that there is enough disorder to prevent the immediate ballistic transmission from one element to another one. Talking of microscopic background, the source of such disorder is not necessarily the scattering at impurities in the bulk of the material. It can be due to scattering on boundaries of the conductor, in the latter case we would have a chaotic ballistic transmission.

One can think of an imaginable element which would provide the crossover between tunnel junction and ballistic constriction. The simplest model for it would be to set all transmissions to a certain value Γ, $1 > \Gamma > 0$, as it has been proposed in [21]. It looks like it is a good model for a semitransparent interface, but one should be cautious: the study of Bauer [20] shows that the transmission distribution of an interface may be very complicated.

4.3 Rules

Let us formulate the set of rules which automate the calculations of transmission distribution for an arbitrary coherent network of the kind we describe.

- I. Construct the two terminal network from the elements which can be diffusive conductors, tunnel junctions and quantum point contacts. Ascribe the "potential" ϕ to one terminal, zero potential to another one, "potentials" θ_i in nodes remain undetermined.

- II. Ascribe the certain $I - \theta$ characteristic to each element. It relates to its conductivity G. For

  - Diffusive conductor: $I(\theta) = G\theta$
  - Tunnel junction: $I(\theta) = G\sin\theta$
  - QPC: $I(\theta) = 2G\tan(\theta/2)$

  θ being the difference between "potentials" of the terminal nodes of the element.

- III. Take into account the current conservation in the nodes. This supplies the number of equation sufficient to determine all θ_i.
- IV. Solve the "potential" distribution in the nodes.
- V. With the aid of this, obtain the total "current" as a function of ϕ.
- VI. Compute the transmission distribution with the aid of Eq. 32.

As we will see below, many physical quantities may be calculated immediately from $I(\phi)$.

5 Examples and results

5.1 Classic results

Here I will present a small collection of physical results which can be obtained making use of universal transmission distribution (9). As it is being stressed throughout the paper, the results are valid for an arbitrary diffusive classical conductor. I am tempted to call these classic rather than classical: the formulas are so elegant and concise.

Before giving those let us first notice that all the quantities mentioned in Sec. 2.3 can be expressed in terms of $I(\phi)$ immediately, without referring to transmission distribution (9). The corresponding relations can be obtained by transformation of (31) .

The excess noise suppression (12) is given by

$$P/P_{Poisson} = \frac{1}{3}\left(1 - \frac{2I'''(0)}{I'(0)}\right) \tag{38}$$

Andreev conductivity (14) can be expressed as follows

$$G_A = I'(\frac{\pi}{2}), \tag{39}$$

and Josephson current (15) appears to be

$$I_J(\phi_{sup}) = \frac{\Delta \sin\phi_{sup}}{2\sqrt{2}e}\int_0^{\phi_{sup}} \frac{I(\phi)d\phi}{\sin(\phi/2)\sqrt{\cos\phi_{sup} - \cos\phi}}. \tag{40}$$

For universal distribution, one has to substitute $I(\phi) = G\phi$. This yields "one-third" suppression [2]

$$P/P_{Poisson} = \frac{1}{3}. \tag{41}$$

For Andreev conductance, the result can not be simpler:

$$G_A = G. \tag{42}$$

This has been proven in [14] by traditional superconductivity methods.

For superconducting current in SNS system we reproduce the result of Kulik and Omel'yanchuk, [22]

$$I_J(\phi_{sup}) = \frac{\pi\Delta}{e}\cos(\phi_{sup}/2)\mathrm{arctanh}(\sin(\phi_{sup}/2)). \tag{43}$$

They indicated an interesting peculiarity: derivative of the current with respect to the phase diverges at $\phi_{sup} \to \pi$. From Eq. 14 we see the reason for that: nonvanishing transmission density at $T \to 1$.

Very interesting results have been recently obtained by Levitov and coworkers. [23] They combine the binomial statistics (13) and the universal transmission distribution. They determined the characteristic function of the number of electrons transmitted through diffusive conductor over time interval t defined as

$$\chi(\lambda) = \sum_K P_K e^{i\lambda K}, \tag{44}$$

P_K being the probability to have K electrons transmitted. They found relatively simple expression

$$\chi(\lambda) = \exp\left(\frac{It}{e}\mathrm{arcsinh}^2\sqrt{e^{i\lambda}-1}\right) \tag{45}$$

I being the average current passing the circuit.

Their expression can be generalized for an arbitrary circuit [24]:

$$\ln\chi(\lambda) = \frac{It}{2e}\int_0^{2\mathrm{arcsinh}^2\sqrt{e^{i\lambda}-1}} I(\phi)d\phi. \tag{46}$$

5.2 Tunnel junction and diffusive conductor

Let us apply the circuit theory to the simplest example. Let us have a diffusive conductor, tunnel junction and another diffusive conductor in series. Although not the most general, this setup is relevant for quasi-one-dimensional geometry, sandwich type geometry and for any situation when the equipotential surface of the voltage distribution coincides with the tunnel interface. We shall match the total currents through the leftmost diffusive conductor,

the tunnel junction and the rightmost conductor. These currents are related to drops of θ at every element by means of the circuit theory rules:

$$I = G_{Nleft}\theta_1 = G_T \sin(\theta_2 - \theta_1) = G_{Nright}(\phi - \theta_2).$$

$\theta_{1,2}$ being "potentials" respectively on the left and on the right side of the tunnel junction. This is enough to express the current in terms of ϕ,

$$I(\phi) = G_N X(\phi); X(\phi) + \frac{G_T}{G_N}\sin(X(\phi) - \phi)) = 0. \tag{47}$$

Here G_N stands for the total conductance of two diffusive parts, $G_N^{-1} = G_{Nleft}^{-1} + G_{Nleft}^{-1}$. To extract the distribution, let us make use of (31). The answer comes in an implicit form which suffice to analyze it,($\alpha \equiv G_T/G_N$)

$$\rho(T) = f\rho_0(T); \tag{48}$$

$$T = \cosh^{-2}\mu \tag{49}$$

$$\mu = \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathrm{arccosh}(\frac{\pi f}{\alpha \sin(\pi f)}) - \alpha\sqrt{(\frac{\pi f}{\alpha \sin(\pi f)})^2 - 1}\cos(\pi f)\right). \tag{50}$$

The distribution is always suppressed in comparison with the universal value. The more resistive is the barrier, the larger is the suppression. If $G_T > G_N$, the distribution remains finite at $T \to 1$, this indicates that a certain fraction of the channels have almost absolute transmission. This fraction declines to zero at $G_T = G_N$. At $G_T > G_N$ the maximal transmission available can not exceed a certain value T_{max}, $T_{max} = 1, G_N = G_T$; $T_{max} = 4G_T^2/G_N \ll 1$, $G_T \ll G_N$.

These features reveal an important new physics which is absent if tunneling occurs between two clean metals. In the latter case, transmissions through the barrier are always restricted by some maximal value depending on the structure of the barrier. Intuitively, one could expect that the same value restricts the maximal transmission through the compound system of the tunnel barrier and diffusive conductor. It is not the case. The average transmission is suppressed by an addition of extra scatterers but some channels become even more transparent having transmissions of the order of unity. This can be comprehended as a result of constructive quantum interference between different trajectories traversing the barrier. If the metals are clean, a typical trajectory reaches the barrier only once either reflecting or getting through. If the metals are disordered, the typical trajectory gets back to the barrier if it was reflected initially. This enhances the possibilities for interference.

The channels with transmissions close to unity have been associated with delocalized states.[4] If the system under consideration were uniform, the disappearance of the delocalized at the point $G_N = G_T$ would have meant the true localization transition. It is clear that something drastic happens at this point, but one should be cautious drawing direct conclusions. We would stress that the mere introduction of the transmission distribution by (7) is an attempt to describe the almost classical system in quantum mechanical terms. This can make the results difficult to interpret. Indeed, neither resistance

$$R = R_T + R_N$$

nor excess noise power

$$P = \frac{P_{classical}}{3}(1 + 2(\frac{R_T}{R})^3)$$

in the system exhibit critical behavior around the transition point within the framework of the semiclassical approach used. Such behavior could emerge from quantum localization corrections. The Josepson current appears to be sensitive to the transition. Indeed, as we mentioned before, the finite transmission density results in divergent current derivative at $\phi_s up = \pi$. On the localized side of the transition there is no such peculiarity.

Eqs. 39 and 47 give the Andreev conductance of the system

$$G_A = G_N/(1 + \cot(X)/X), \cos(X)/X = G_N/G_T;$$

this coincides with the result of [25] in the relevant limit.

5.3 Two tunnel junctions

We consider next two tunnel junctions in series. As it was explained above we assume diffusive motion of electron between the junctions, albeit the resistance of the disordered region is supposed to be much smaller than the resistance of the junctions.

We find the "current" by equating the "currents" through each junctions, θ being the "potential" of the middle, $G_{1,2}$ being junction conductances,

$$I(\phi) = G_1 \sin(\theta) = G_2 \sin(\phi - \theta); \tag{51}$$
$$I(\phi) = \frac{G_1 G_2 \sin\phi}{\sqrt{G_1^2 + G_2^2 + 2G_1 G_2 \cos\phi}}$$

Performing analytical continuation (32), we readily find the transmission distribution:

$$\rho(T) = \frac{G}{2\pi G_Q} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T(T_c - T)}}, \quad T < T_c, T_c \equiv \frac{4G_1G_2}{(G_1+G_2)^2} \tag{52}$$

First, this transmission distribution differs drastically from that one for a single tunnel barrier being spread at $T \simeq 1$. This is due to resonant transmission via electron states localized between junctions. Second, it always has a gap at T close to unity if the junction conductances do not match. We shall conclude that the equal probabilities to escape to each side provide a necessary condition for the resonant state to transmit with unitary probability.

From Eqs. 38, 39 and Eq. 52 we obtain noise suppression and Andreev conductance

$$P/P_{Poisson} = 1 - \frac{G_1G_2}{(G_1+G_2)^2}, \quad G_A = \frac{G_1^2G_2^2}{(G_1^2+G_2^2)^{3/2}}. \tag{53}$$

5.4 Two point contacts

Now we consider transmission through two point contacts. If there is a possibility of a direct ballistic transmission through both of them, the total conductance is determined by a maximal number of transmitted channels, $G = min\{G_1, G_2\}$. Otherwise Ohm's law $R = R_1 + R_2$ is restored and we are able to apply the circuit theory.

Again we find $I(\phi)$ by equating "currents":

$$I(\phi)/2 = G_1 \tan(\theta/2) = G_2 \tan((\phi - \theta)/2); \tag{54}$$
$$I(\phi) = (G_1+G_2)\cot(\phi/2)\{\sqrt{1 + \frac{4G_1G_2}{(G_1+G_2)^2}\tan^2(\phi/2)} - 1\}.$$

This gives the following transmission distribution:

$$\rho(T) = \frac{2(G_1+G_2)}{\pi G_Q T}\sqrt{\frac{T-T_c}{1-T}} \quad \text{at } T > T_c; \quad T_c = (\frac{G_1-G_2}{G_1+G_2})^2, \tag{55}$$

$\rho(T) = 0$ otherwise. It is almost exactly reversed if compared with two tunnel junction case. Again, the distribution is spread to $T \simeq 1$. But it has a gap at small transmissions. The gap is closed if the two QPC conductances

match. If one of the conductances is much bigger than another one, the distribution shrinks to $T = 1$ approaching a single QPC distribution.

Noise suppression and Andreev conductance for this case read

$$P/P_{Poisson} = \frac{G_1 G_2}{(G_1 + G_2)^2}, \quad G_A = (G_1 + G_2)(1 - \frac{G_1 + G_2}{\sqrt{G_1^2 + G_2^2 + 6G_1 G_2}}). \quad (56)$$

Two QPC in series may serve as a simplest microscopic model of so-called chaotic cavity. In such a system, the scattering at the boundaries only is important. At arbitrary shape of the boundaries, a particle entering the cavity moves chaotically and experiences many collisions before leaving it.

It has been conjectured in [26, 27] that the scattering matrix of the system is a member of Dyson circular ensemble. This is a typical judgment of random matrix theorists about real things: it is a bolt from the blue and does not look provable. Let us see if we can check it. For the Dyson circular ensemble, in the semiclassical limit of large number of channels, the transmission distribution reads [27]

$$\rho(T) = \frac{G}{\pi G_Q} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T(1-T)}} \quad (57)$$

in our notations. It is precisely what we got if $G_1 = G_2$! It is a strong argument in support of the conjecture. However, for more general situation $G_1 \neq G_2$ we have qualitatively different transmission distribution. The random matrix theory obviously skips some interesting physics being insensitive to such "details".

I wish to thank C. W. J. Beenakker, L. S. Levitov and D. E. Khmelnitskii. I greatly profited from each discussion with those.

References

[1] Landauer, R., Philos. Mag. **21**, 863 (1970).

[2] C. W. J. Beenakker, M. Büttiker, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 1889 (1992).

[3] O. N. Dorokhov, Solid State Comm. **51**, 381 (1984);

[4] Y. Imry, Europhys. Lett. **1**, 249 (1986); J. B. Prendy, A. MacKinnen, A. B. Prete, Physica A **168**, 400 (1990).

[5] P. A. Mello, P. Pereyra, and N. Kumar, Ann. Phys. **181**, 290 (1988).

[6] Yu. V. Nazarov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 134 (1994).

[7] M. Büttiker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 2901 (1990).

[8] G. B. Lesovik, JETP Lett. **49**, 592 (1989).

[9] L. S. Levitov and G. B. Lesovik, preprint 9401004 at babbage.sissa.it, JETP Lett. **58**, 235 (1993).

[10] C. W. J. Beenakker, Phys. Rev. B, **46**, 12841 (1992).

[11] C. W. J. Beenakker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 3836 (1991).

[12] Th. M. Nieuwenhuizen and M. C. W. van Rossum, to appear in Phys. Rev. Lett.

[13] P. A. Lee and T. V. Ramakrishnan, Rev. Mod. Phys. **57**, 287 (1987).

[14]

[15] A. I. Larkin and Yu. V. Ovchinninkov, Sov. Phys. JETP **41**,960 (1975).

[16] K. D. Usadel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **25**, 507 (1970); A. I. Larkin and Yu. V. Ovchinnikov, Sov. Phys. JETP **41**, 155 (1977).

[17] M. Yu. Kuprianov and V. F. Lukichev, Sov. Phys. JETP **67**, 1163 (1988).

[18] B. J. van Wees, H. van Houten, C. W. J. Beenakker, J. G. Williamson, L P. Kouwenhoven, D. van der Marel and C. T. Foxon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 848 (1988).

[19] L. I. Glazman, G. B. Lesovik, D. E. Khmelnitskii, and R. I. Shekhter, JETP Lett. **48**, 238 (1988).

[20] G. E. W. Bauer, to appear in Phys. Rev. Lett.

[21] C. W. J. Beenakker, B. Rejaei, and J. A. Melsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2470 (1994).

[22] I. O. Kulik and A. N. Omelyanchuk, JETP Lett. **21**, 96 (1975).

[23] H. Lee, A. Yu. Iakovetz, and L. S. Levitov, submitted to Phys. Rev. B., preprint 9403009 at babbage.sissa.it.

[24] Yu.V. Nazarov, to be published.

[25] A. F. Volkov, A. V. Zaitsev, and T. M. Klapwijk, Physica C, **210**, 21 (1993).

[26] H. U. Barranger and P. A. Mello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 142 (1994).

[27] R. A. Jalambert, J.-L. Pichard, and C. W. J. Beenakker, Europhys. Lett. **27**, 255 (1994).